

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MICHAEL C. RATLIFF,

Petitioner,

vs.

STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

Case No. 3:07-CV-00313-LRH-(VPC)

ORDER

The Court dismissed this action without prejudice to Petitioner commencing a new action in which he paid the filing fee or applied for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Instead of following instructions, Petitioner filed an Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (#8) and a Motion for Correction and Clarification (#10). The Court denied those motions, telling Petitioner again that he needed to commence a new action. Order (#9).

Once more, instead of following instructions, Petitioner has submitted a Motion to Reconsider (#11), an Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (#12), and a Motion for a Pretrial Conference (#13). The Motion to Reconsider (#11) contains an argument about filing fees that the Court has already rejected in its earlier Order (#9). In both the Motion to Reconsider (#11) and the Motion for a Pretrial Conference (#13), Petitioner complains that the Clerk of the Court filed what should have been two separate petitions for writs of mandamus in this one action, which is irrelevant to the reason why the Court dismissed this action. Petitioner remains free to commence a new action, or actions, in which he submits an application to proceed in forma pauperis with the correct documents.

1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Motion to Reconsider (#11), Application to
2 Proceed in Forma Pauperis (#12), and Motion for a Pretrial Conference (#13) are **DENIED**.

3 DATED this 30th day of October, 2007.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "L. Hicks", is written over a faint circular stamp.

6
7 LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE